COURT FEE 10 RS. भारत INDIA दस रुपये TEN RUPEES CANCELLED

IN THE HIGH COURT OF OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 2093/2003

Petitioner : President, Maa Bamleshwari Trust Samittee, Dongargarh, Distt. Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. Chintamani Singh, S/o Shri Tribhuvan Singh,
2. Rajendra Prasad Mishra S/o Kamla Prashad Mishra
3. Dhelu Ram Mandavi S/o Ramulal Mandavi
4. Ramdas Patel S/o Milap Ram Patel
5. Dilip Ram S/o Budharam Nirmalkar
6. Biselal Patel S/o Guhari Ram Patel
7. Punu Ram Gond S/o Raghu Prashad Patel
8. Siya Ram Yadav S/o Ghasia Ram
9. Lalchand Verma S/o Tullu Ram Verma
10. Bharat Ram Chandravanshi S/o Anand Ram
11. Santosh Baghel S/o Bahal Singh Baghel
12. Rajesh Yadav S/o Prem Singh Yadav
13. Chhabilal Yadav S/o Bukhalal Yadav

N.C Patel

P. R. No. 1962/03
Presented by Shri Pankaj Agrawal
dated 18.09.03

14. Tarun Singh
S/o Narayan Singh

15. Kapurchandra
S/o Dayaram Chandravanshi

16. Santosh Tiwari
S/o Ramkumar

17. Dwarka Verma
S/o Lathkor Verma

18. Johar Ram
S/o Damru Ram Verma

19. Tijuram Patel
S/o Tegi Ram Patel

All Care of :- Shri Rajendra Prashad Mishra S/o Shri Kamla Prasad Mishra, Resident of Misicha Bara, Kalka Para, Dongargarh, Distt. Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

20. Presiding Officer, Labour Court under I.D.Act, Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 227 CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(13)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. No. 2093/2003

Petitioner	President, Maa Bamleshwari Trust Samittee, Dongargarh.
	Versus
Respondents	Chintamani Singh and others.

Shri H.B. Agrawal learned Sr. counsel with Ku. Sangita Mishra for the petitioner.

Shri Alok Bakshi counsel for respondents 1 to 11, 14, 15 and 17 & 19.

ORDER
(Passed on 9.3.2007)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner does not want to press any other ground except that the petitioner be granted an opportunity to raise a ground on merit as well as on facts before the appellate authority, if such an occasion arises regarding the legality and validity of the inquiry, to which learned counsel appearing for respondents 1 to 11, 14, 15 and 17 & 19 has no objection. Even otherwise, the submission of the petitioner seems to be justified and reasonable as by order of this Court dated 1.7.2004 proceeding was permitted to go on but the final order was directed not to be passed.

Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with liberty as aforesaid.

No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge